

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAURA LOOMER,
Plaintiff,
v.
FACEBOOK INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-03154-HSG](#)

**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Re: Dkt. No. 84

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Laura Loomer's motion to extend the time to respond to Defendant Facebook, Inc.'s motion for summary judgment. *See* Dkt. No. 84. The Court has several concerns with this motion specifically and the case more generally.

First, and most significantly, Plaintiff's counsel Larry Klayman still has not filed an application to appear *pro hac vice* as required by Civil Local Rule 11-3. Instead, in the signature block on the motion to extend time, Mr. Klayman indicates "Pro Hac Vice to be Submitted." *See id.* at 2. But Mr. Klayman has had more than enough time to file a *pro hac vice* application. Judge Rodney Smith transferred this action from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida on April 13, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 56. The Clerk of Court for the Northern District of California reassigned the case to this Court on May 20, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 65. And the Court held a telephonic case management conference on July 7, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 83. Mr. Klayman may not practice in this Court without being granted permission to proceed *pro hac vice*. Accordingly, before Mr. Klayman may file any opposition to the motion for summary judgment (or any other document), he must first file and have his *pro hac vice* application approved. The Court further cautions Mr. Klayman that his continued efforts to appear in this case when he is not admitted to practice before this Court may subject him to sanctions for


1 unauthorized practice under Civil Local Rule 11-8.

2 *Second*, Plaintiff has styled this motion for an extension of time as a “consent motion,” and
3 indicates that “Defendants’ counsel consent to the requested relief.” *See* Dkt. No. 84 at 2. To the
4 extent the parties have agreed, the proper mechanism to request an extension of the briefing
5 schedule was a stipulated request for order changing time. *See* Civil Local Rule 6-2. The Court
6 therefore **DIRECTS** Defendant to confirm by August 6, 2020, at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time whether
7 it “consented” to the summary judgment briefing schedule as indicated in Plaintiff’s motion.

8 *Lastly*, the Court strongly encourages all counsel to familiarize themselves with the Civil
9 Local Rules and this Court’s Standing Orders. The Court expects counsel to fully comply with the
10 applicable Local Rules and Standing Orders moving forward.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: August 5, 2020

13 
14 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28